

Date: Wed, 28 Jul 93 04:30:22 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #268
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 28 Jul 93 Volume 93 : Issue 268

Today's Topics:

 1947 No Code survey (was Re: References for Code vs
 around....around.....around....around....
 ARRL and it's members (2 msgs)
 ARRL Internet connection (2 msgs)
 ARRL opposes temporary permits
 Damn the torpedoes (was Re: 1947 No Code)
 Give a VE \$5.60, walk

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 27 Jul 93 13:44:12 GMT
From: dds1!indep1!clifto@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 1947 No Code survey (was Re: References for Code vs
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jul26.173806.4528@ssc.com> markz@ssc.com (Mark Zenier) writes:
>Rev. Michael P. Deignan (kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com) wrote:

>: Clearly not. Therefore, I've come to the conclusion that the 3A and 3B
>: elements ought to be recombined, and the question pool re-written to
>: shore up the theory. Then, modify the license requirements so that
>: Techs, regardless of code level, should pass Element 3.
>

>3B? I'd sure like to see the version of the question pool for that test
>in the whatever wierd dimension you live in. HF band limits, Antennas,
>propagation. The reason it's not combined is that the material tested
>is irrelevant for VHF.

I wholeheartedly agree, with one reservation; those who can't pass tests about irrelevant things like antennas and propagation shouldn't be allowed to use them. After all, they're irrelevant on VHF. (Oh, propagation being irrelevant on VHF, I should also suggest that those who can't pass the tests not be allowed on the VHF bands during episodes of sporadic-E propagation.)

The original no-code proposal was widely promoted all over packet as having a MUCH more stringent theory test than the standard Tech test. By the time it was put into place, "MUCH more stringent" meant five more questions. And now you and others like you are already pushing to keep the testing as ridiculously simple as it is, perhaps even to make it easier.

I would, though, waive the Element 3 requirement for those hardy enough to take the code exam and pass it.

```
--
+-----+
|  Cliff Sharp  |      clifto@indep1.chi.il.us   OR  clifto@indep1.uucp   |
|  WA9PDM       |      Use whichever one works                        |
+-----+
```

Date: 28 Jul 93 07:11:27 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: around....around.....around....around....
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1860@arrl.org> ehare@arrl.org (Ed Hare - KA1CV) writes:
>In rec.radio.amateur.policy, gganderson@augustana.edu (Kevin Anderson -7325)
writes:

>
>>Either way I can't afford equipment. Some speak of young people
>>not having funds. Well, I am not that young or that old, but
>>I certainly don't have funds either. So right now I have to
>>settle for the license.

>
>Kevin,
>
>Thanks for the opportunity to speak out on an issue more directly
>related to my real job: things technical. :-).

>
>Ham radio doesn't have to be expensive! The various ham magazines
>have been publishing simple, homebrew circuits that one can put
>together for a few dollars. These are only a few watts, and not
>up to the performance of the modern kilobuck transceiver, and are

>mostly CW (PLEASE, DON'T FLAME ME TO ASH -- I AM A BIT TOASTY
>OF LATE), but can be easily put together and used for real contacts.

What you say is true, but how much of it is self selection bias?
There are simple one chip FM transmitter designs, and simple one
chip FM reciever designs suitable for repeater access, but we rarely
see such in QST. It's the same old 40 meter CW circuit instead.
There are simple RTTY TU designs available, but we find another
20 meter CW transceiver design inside. Phasing SSB is now practical
with easily available chips, but we find an 80 meter DC receiver
optimized for CW inside.

I looked at the July cover and said to myself, "Oh boy, space
coverage." Then I looked inside and found the lead feature
article about operating CW on a motorcycle, and a construction
project for a keyer.

When I spotted the August issue in the mailbox, I saw a RTTY
tuning scope on the cover. I said, "Oh boy, a RTTY project."
Then I looked inside in vain for the RTTY project. Instead
I found *contest* results buried in the mice type. Phooey!

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Tue, 27 Jul 93 18:41:34 CDT
From: cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!
robert@uunet.uu.net
Subject: ARRL and it's members
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

ehare@arrl.org (Ed Hare - KA1CV) writes:

> In rec.radio.amateur.policy, robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:
>
> >Fair enough, Ed. Most of the discussion on this newgroup has centered
> >around the Codeless Technician license. First of all, the ARRL *is* the
> >representative organization by and for the amateur radio community in
> >the United States. Several years ago, the ARRL (after receiving support
> >from our fraternity, including mine) put forth a proposal to the FCC that
> >a codeless entry-level license be created. This license would convey all
> >amateur privileges 222 MHz (then 220) and above.

>
> >My question for you is, why didn't this proposal pass, and why do we now
> >have something completely different than what we approved?
>
> Well, this proposal passed the ARRL Board of Directors. Unfortunately,
> it didn't pass the FCC. Contrary to popular rumor, the FCC does not always
> jump exactly to the ARRL tune. I am not speaking with authority
> on this, and my opinion on the FCC's motives is pure conjecture,
> but I suspect that the FCC decided to take the path of least
> resistance and do what was easiest for the FCC: simplify the
> proposals into the one that was NOT a major restructuring of the
> Amateur Radio Service license classes. Considering that the idea had
> support from several quarters (the final version is quite similar to
> that proposed by the QCWA) made it all the easier.
>
> In the final run, we did what our Board of Directors perceived that
> our members wanted, admittedly by a slim margin.
>
> I suspect that Perry Williams, who works here at HQ but is NOT a
> regular reader of r.r.a., could expand on this quite a bit, possibly
> speaking with some authority on the reasons the FCC made their
> decision the way they did. I will pass your question along to Perry
> and see what kind of answer we get.

Thanks, Ed.

--Robert

Date: Sun, 25 Jul 1993 13:13:39 +0000
From: pipex!warwick!qmw-dcs!qmw!demon!llondel.demon.co.uk!dave@uunet.uu.net
Subject: ARRL and it's members
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <24i97B1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com> robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

> ron@topaz.bds.com (Ron Natalie) writes:
>
> > This whining that the League doesn't represent it's members is the same
> > as people who don't vote whining that congress doesn't represent them either.
>
> I vote, Ron, but I certainly don't pay \$30.00 a year for the privilege!
>
If you are referring to voting for congress, then I bet it costs you far more than \$30! Especially when the majority get it wrong :-)

Dave

* G4WRW @ GB7WRW.#41.GBR.EU AX25 * You think *you* have problems? *
* dave@llondel.demon.co.uk Internet * What do you do if you *are* *
* g4wrw@g4wrw.ampr.org Amprnet * a manically depressed robot?? *

Date: Tue, 27 Jul 1993 19:52:55 GMT
From: pacbell.com!att-out!cbfsb!cbnews!cbnewst!cbnewsm!
gdo%aloft.att.com@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: ARRL Internet connection
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1823@arrl.org>, jrbloom@arrl.org (Jon Bloom, KE3Z) writes:
|> In rec.radio.amateur.misc, jherndo@eis.calstate.edu (John Herndon) writes:
|> >Well, stop taking it out of "the back pockets" of ARRL members. As quite
|> >a few of us have seen, the ARRL is now connected to the Internet. Drop
|> >the DIRECT connection, and save several thousand dollars a month.
|>
|> In fact, we pay something in the neighborhood of \$2000 *per year* for
|> our dial-up connection. *I* feel that the additional service we are
|> able to provide to our members is more than worth that amount.
|>

I, for one, applaud the ARRL for connecting to the Internet. I find it to be an extremely useful forum for communicating with them. The folks from the ARRL are also active participants in the discussions on "the net" as they should be.

I don't always agree with the ARRL positions (God, that would be boring :-)), but let's cut 'em a break. Being a voice that speaks for the majority of the amateur masses, the ARRL deserves to have a reliable Internet connection. After all, isn't one purpose of the Amateur Radio Service to promote technical innovation? This IS the 1990's and the ARRL belongs here.

Lord, forgive me, for I have added fuel to yet another flame war! I do, however, believe that most will agree with me.

--

Glenn D. O'Donnell, N3BDA Internet: gdo@aloft.att.com
AT&T Bell Laboratories Packet: n3bda@n3dpu.pa.usa.na
Allentown, PA

Date: Wed, 28 Jul 1993 07:51:06 GMT
From: news.cerf.net!kaiwan.com!wetware!khijol!erc@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: ARRL Internet connection
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Glenn D. O'Donnell (gdo@aloft.att.com) wrote:

: I, for one, applaud the ARRL for connecting to the Internet. I find it to be
: an extremely useful forum for communicating with them. The folks from the
: ARRL are also active participants in the discussions on "the net" as they
: should be.

: I don't always agree with the ARRL positions (God, that would be boring :-)),
: but let's cut 'em a break. Being a voice that speaks for the majority of the
: amateur masses, the ARRL deserves to have a reliable Internet connection.
: After all, isn't one purpose of the Amateur Radio Service to promote technical
: innovation? This IS the 1990's and the ARRL belongs here.

Totally agree! The ARRL belongs on the forefront of innovation. To quote
from CFR 97.1(b):

Continuation and extension of the amateur's proven ability to contribute to
the advancement of the radio art.

If getting on the Internet, pushing packet, AMTOR, spread spectrum, etc.
aren't contributing "to the advancement of the radio art", I don't know
what is.

--

Ed Carp, N7EKG erc@apple.com 510/659-9560

If you want magic, let go of your armor. Magic is so much stronger than
steel! -- Richard Bach, "The Bridge Across Forever"

Date: 28 Jul 93 06:53:44 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: ARRL opposes temporary permits
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <231pgmINNh5o@west.West.Sun.COM> flloyd@l1-a.west.sun.com (Fred Lloyd
[Phoenix SE]) writes:

>In article <1801@arrl.org> jlbloom@arrl.org (Jon Bloom, KE3Z) writes:

>>

>>I have no faith whatsoever in the Perot-ian concept of direct voter

>>issue-by-issue polling.

>

>Okay, so now we know who you voted for.

>
>If I were apathetic, then I wouldn't be writing this. What I'm
>talking about here is access, which the ARRL has done nothing in
>recent years to improve. Representative government was designed to
>solve the problems of the 18th Century, when neither radio nor
>telephones existed. Just because it's been in place for years
>does not mean that it's necessarily the best way of doing it.

Representative government was meant to temper mob rule. And constitutional
representative government was meant to temper even that. It's
still as valid today as ever. Opinions are like assholes, everybody
has one, but that doesn't necessarily mean they have a clue about
the real issues or the ramifications of policy decisions. That's
why we elect representatives whose job it is to understand these
issues and make *informed* choices for us. It's not perfect, as
Thomas Jefferson said, "It's the worst form of government, aside
from all the others."

>>I quite agree that the level of participation in ARRL elections is
>>abysmal. But changing to a referendum system throws the baby out
>>with the bath water.

>
>Then how about a non-binding, advisory vote in which the results are
>published? After all, the people who make the decisions could use
>a dose of reality once in a while.

You mean like the infamous HF autoforwarding survey? Surveys are biased
by the squeaky wheel effect. Those who perceive that their vested interests
would be harmed squeal the loudest. That's rarely representative.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: 27 Jul 1993 19:22:25 -0700
From: olivea@apple.com!apple.com!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Damn the torpedoes (was Re: 1947 No Code)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jul27.175242.157384@locus.com> dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H.
Myers) writes:

>In article <5c.716.28.0N178922@pplace.com> pat.wilson@pplace.com (Pat Wilson)
writes:

>>-> And I'm sick of people telling me I _must_ learn code.
>>
>>No one is telling you that you _must_ learn code. But you damned well
>>better learn it if you want to work other bands.
>
>Hmmm... "damned well better learn it" ?
>
>>It has nothing to do with building anything. It is a test designed to
>>make you study and learn. Nothing else. So, either learn it and pass
>>or complain and wait for the rules to change for you. Either way, good
>>luck on the codeless tech and welcome to 2 meters. (grin)
>
>The amateur tests aren't there just to make people study and learn.
>They are they to encourage people to develop knowledge and skills
>valuable to the amateur radio service, and, in turn, to American
>commercial and military radio services. The question that should be
>answered is "Is the skill promoted by the CW test as important to
>radio today as it was 40 years ago?". At some point, you may discover
>that there are a number of skills, other than CW, as important to radio
>today as CW was 40 years ago. You may then understand why the CW test is
>looking increasingly dated.

At the risk of adding more fuel to the fire, CW is becoming increasingly
less relevant as an important skill for future communicator training.
This is not to say that CW is not a fun mode for those that choose to use
it -- but so are AM, SSB, FM, ATV, packet, rtty and whatever else interests
you personally. CW is the ultimate multiple choice, rote memorization skill;
it requires little or no intelligence, but lots of ear-hand coordination. Of
course, all the other modes require little or no intelligence, either -- its
what you DO and SAY, not how you say it.

I propose that we abandon all the morse code tests and replace them with
a comprehensive test of civility, manners, and consideration for others.

Passing this test will do a lot more for amateur radio than CW ever will.

Don KD6JTT, ex-WN1PZT

--

Don North ---- Apple Computer, Inc. ---- Advanced Technology Group
...!apple!north north@apple.com NORTH KD6JTT etc,etc,etc

{ Facts are facts, but any opinions expressed are my own, and *do not* }
{ represent any viewpoint, official or otherwise, of Apple Computer, Inc }

Date: 27 Jul 93 12:22:11 GMT
From: ddsww1!indep1!clifto@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Give a VE \$5.60, walk
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <qX167B8w165w@GRAFex.Cupertino.CA.US> ka6etb@GRAFex.Cupertino.CA.US (KA6ETB Steve Harding) writes:

>randy@cyphyn.UUCP (Randy) writes:

>> There's too many of them, and they gang up on you,deliberatly QRM, and

>> ...well...so much for 'teaching'.

>

>Perhaps it has something to do with your attitude.

Perhaps it has something to do with their attitudes. The most polite I've heard was someone who politely listened to a ham trying to help the guy improve his operating procedures, then showed up on another repeater ridiculing the other ham (who had a K9xxx call) and saying, "Imagine him telling me how to operate a radio! I've had my CB for five years!" The most common response I've heard is to ignore the helper-ham and go on doing the same damn thing forever. It's not uncommon to hear "Fuck you" in response to a nicely-worded operating suggestion. It's not uncommon to hear a helper-ham jammed for weeks after he makes a suggestion.

Personally, I don't bother. I don't need that crap; that's why I've never been a CBer.

--

```
+-----+
|  Cliff Sharp  |      clifto@indep1.chi.il.us  OR  clifto@indep1.uucp  |
|   WA9PDM     |                        Use whichever one works      |
+-----+
```

Date: 27 Jul 93 13:18:46 GMT
From: ddsww1!indep1!clifto@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul22.144236.25076@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>,
<CAKz25.751@srngenprp.sr.hp.com>, <CAsACL.4v5@squam.banyan.com>
Subject : Re: Code/NoCode

In article <CAsACL.4v5@squam.banyan.com> dts@banyan.com (Daniel Senie) writes:

>In article <CAKz25.751@srngenprp.sr.hp.com>, alanb@sr.hp.com (Alan Bloom) writes:

>|> When the Novice license was introduced in the 50's it was for a 1-year

>|> term and NON-RENEWABLE. It was considered a temporary beginners license.

>

>And unless you had a good support network of local Elmers, that's exactly what
>happened, you never got on the air and the license expired. That's what happened

>to WN1SMS, which I held in the early 70's. It wasn't 'till the nocode was added

That certainly isn't what happened to WN9PDM, licensed at age 14 in 1965. No elmers, no nothing. I had to force myself to learn electronics from reading magazines like Radio-Electronics, Electronics Illustrated and that ilk. I learned the rules and regs by reading part 97. I got my own code speed up past 13 WPM by listening to commercial ship-to-shore CW stations.

Having an elmer might have been nice, but I didn't give up in the absence of one because I wanted my license badly enough.

My license did expire once a few years back, mainly because the local FCC office never seems to have a form 610 (they promise it'll be sent out that day, I forget about it and then look at my license and find out I'm not supposed to operate!), but never because I waited for someone to show me what I needed to know to get the license. (The FCC never DID send that 610; I had to find my own way to get one.)

>Back at the age of 12, it took me 6 months to get a receiver (that drifted badly)

Took me three years to get my Star Roamer. Talk about drift... but it got me on the air on 40 CW (after another 1-1/2 year wait to afford a Knight T-60 transmitter). And sensitivity? "Sensitive Star Roamer" was as much an oxymoron as "Government intelligence".

>and I never did get a transmitter. I did not have a parent who was a ham, and did >not know any hams in the community. Non-renewable, short-term licenses are really >not the answer...

For the reasons stated above, I wholeheartedly disagree. I had one parent who was interested in DXing (we'd watch TV DX together) and always wished he'd gotten a ham license, but never did anything about it until he came to the thought "If my 14-year-old can do it, I can do it"; basically, I elmered him. I knew two hams in my community, one licensed about the same time I was and another who worked nights and thus was almost totally inaccessible to me. It didn't stop me. I wanted the license badly enough that I got it regardless of how many people weren't wetnursing me.

--

```
+-----+
|  Cliff Sharp  |      clifto@indep1.chi.il.us   OR  clifto@indep1.uucp   |
|    WA9PDM    |                        Use whichever one works          |
+-----+
```

Date: Wed, 28 Jul 1993 08:43:40 GMT
From: concert!gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@decwrl.dec.com
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <INcB8B7w165w@balsam.pinetree.org>, <CAsxp1.J2D@mentor.cc.purdue.edu>,

<2394@indep1.UUCP>~,
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: Damn the torpedoes (was Re: 1947 No Code)

In article <2394@indep1.UUCP> clifto@indep1.UUCP (Cliff Sharp) writes:
>In article <CASxp1.J2D@mentor.cc.purdue.edu> blumb@sage.cc.purdue.edu (Bill Blum)
writes:

>>What does learning code have to do with building a satellite rig?
>>What does it have to do with setting up an antenna?
>>Not much.

>
> What does:
> *knowing Part 97
> *knowing Ohm's law
> *knowing about RTTY
> *knowing about AMTOR
> *knowing about packet
> *knowing about proper operating procedures
> *knowing about EME
> *etc.

>have to do with building a satellite rig?
>What does it have to do with setting up an antenna?
>Not much.

Not true. Knowing Part 97 is necessary to make sure you're operating legally with the right power, frequency, and lack of spurious response. Knowing Ohm's law isn't strictly necessary, but it's helpful if you find part of your station isn't working. Knowing about RTTY and AMTOR can be useful because both are used on satellite. Knowing about packet is essential since several of the satellites are packet only. Knowing proper operating procedures is essential to effective communications. Knowing about EME is important if your satellite station intends to use the *natural* satellite. ETC. Knowing manual Morse is only useful if you want to use manual Morse to communicate via your satellite station. Some do, some don't.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #268
